35. The monoclonal antibody of claim 23 which is a chimeric antibody.

36. The monoclonal antibody of claim 22 which is a humanized antibody.

37. The monoclonal antibody of claim 23 which is a humanized antibody.

38. The monoclonal antibody of claim 21 wherein said at least one type of mammalian cell is a cancer cell.

39. The monoclonal antibody of claim 22 wherein said at least one type of mammalian cell is a cancer cell.

40. The monoclonal antibody of claim 23 wherein said at least one type of mammalian cell is a cancer cell.

41. The monoclonal antibody of claim 24 wherein said at least one type of mammalian cell is a cancer cell. --

REMARKS

Claims 8-10 and 19-29 are pending and are the subject of the present office action. The Examiner has stated in the office action that claims 8-10 are in condition for allowance.

In the above amendment, claims 19 and 20 were canceled without prejudice in an effort to advance the prosecution of the present application. Applicants reserve the right to pursue these now canceled claims in a further continuation application. Claims 21-26 and 29 have been amended, and claims 30-41 have been added. Support for such claims can be found on at least pages 15-16, 50, 53, and 66-68, and it is therefore believed that no new matter has been introduced.

The undersigned attorney of record would first like to thank the Examiner again for the opportunity to discuss the office action in the present application and Applicant's co-pending application serial nos. 09/079,029 and 08/857,216 during the interview on October 19, 2000 at the Patent Office. It is believed that the claim amendments shown above are in accordance with those discussed during that interview. To further

clarify the form of the native Apo-2 receptor polypeptide identified by Applicant (as described in Example 1 of the specification), certain of the claims have been amended to identify that the amino sequence of that full length Apo-2 receptor includes the contiguous sequence of amino acid residues 1 to 411 of SEQ ID NO:1.

In the office action, claims 19-29 were rejected under Section 112, first and second paragraphs. It is believed that the claim amendments above overcome these rejections. Particularly, it is believed that the amended claim language further clarifies the subject claims. Should the Examiner consider that the now amended claims are not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned to discuss any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

GENENTECH, INC.

Date: November 9, 2000

By: Diane L. Marschang
Diane L. Marschang
Reg. No. 35,600

1 DNA Way
So. San Francisco, CA 94080-4990
Phone: (650) 225-5416
Fax: (650) 952-9881